

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 12-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for new matter; claims 1-4, 12 and 13 were provisionally rejected for double patenting in view of application 09/921,465; claims 1, 3 and 6-7 were rejected as anticipated by Jahn; claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 14-20 were rejected as anticipated by Madden; and claims 1, 4, 6, 7 and 12-20 were rejected as anticipated by Friel.


As to the double patenting rejection, the present claims have been amended and are distinguished from the co-pending application 09/921,465 and therefore it is believed that the two pending applications no longer have claims subject to an obviousness type double patenting rejection, and favorable reconsideration is requested. Although Applicants traverse the rejections for new matter, the claims have been amended to delete reference to hardware thereby obviating the rejection. Applicants preserve the right to pursue such claim language in a continuation application.

Claim 1 has been substantially amended to further recite a system that includes a manufacturer's database, a customer database, a configurator module and a monitor module, the system being directed to monitoring and configuring a material application system as recited in the claim. The art of record is not directed to monitoring and configuring material application systems including at least a gun and pump available from the manufacturer. New claims 21-22 are directed to a system for monitoring and configuring a material application system including a database that is accessible from a manufacturer's site and from a customer's site over a communication network, wherein the network contains information as recited about the material application system. No new matter has been added.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 27, 2005

By:   
Leonard L. Lewis, Reg. No. 31,176  
Customer No. 27483